



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/661,587	09/15/2003	Kuo-Jung Hsu	TOP 322	8059
23995	7590	11/21/2007	EXAMINER	
RABIN & Berdo, PC 1101 14TH STREET, NW SUITE 500 WASHINGTON, DC 20005			SHERMAN, STEPHEN G	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2629	
			MAIL DATE	
			11/21/2007	DELIVERY MODE
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/661,587	HSU, KUO-JUNG
	Examiner Stephen G. Sherman	Art Unit 2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 October 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,4-15 and 17-22 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,4-15 and 17-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 15 September 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 30 October 2007 has been entered. Claims 1, 4-15 and 17-22 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 30 October 2007 with respect to claims 1, 4-15 and 17-22 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant states on page 7 of the response that Kawa et al. does not teach the claimed limitations of the independent claims as amended. Specifically, on page 8 of the response, the applicant states that the Office Action used Figure 3(b) of Kawa et al. to depict an internal surface having a receiving portion, and that Figure 3(b) of Kawa et al. depicts a flat internal surface and therefore Kawa does not teach of the internal surface having a receiving portion comprising a concave portion. The examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner agrees that Figure 3(b) does not show this

feature of the claims, however, the applicant had already claimed this feature in claim 4, where the examiner explained in the rejection that Paragraph [0025] states that the material where the track pad 53 is located should be made to be thin, which means that if that it is thin and the rest of the surface is thicker, then this portion will be concave. Therefore, even though Figure 3(b) does not show this feature, Kawa still discloses the feature, and thus the rejection is maintained.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 4 and 17-18 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claim 4 recites that the receiving portion has a concave portion, however, claim 1 already recites this feature. Claims 17 and 18 both state that there is a flange on the external surface, and the flange surrounds the surface correspond to the receiving portion, which is already claimed in claims 20 and 22, respectively.

4. Claims 17-18, 20 and 22 are objected to because of the following informalities: the claim both state: "...flange surround the surface correspond to the receiving portion" which should be changed to recite: "...flange surround the surface corresponding to the receiving portion". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 17 and 18 recite the limitation "the identifier". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

8. Claims 1, 4 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Kawa et al. (JP 2002-297309).

Regarding claim 1, Kawa et al. disclose a notebook computer with a hidden touch pad (Drawing 1), comprising:

a main portion including a housing portion (Drawing 1 shows body 2 which is a housing portion.),

wherein the housing portion further includes an internal surface having an receiving portion comprising a concave portion (Drawing 3b and paragraph [0023] explain that the body 2 has the surface shown as item 54 in the drawing, and that this internal side has a portion for receiving the touch pad. Paragraph [0025] states that the material where the track pad 53 is located should be made to be thin, which means that if that it is thin and the rest of the surface is thicker, then this portion will be concave.).

a display connected to the main portion in a rotatable manner (Drawing 1 shows display section 3); and

a touch pad disposed onto the concave portion (Drawing 3b shows that touchpad portion 53 is received by the body 2. Paragraph [0025] states that the material where the track pad 53 is located should be made to be thin, which means that if that it is thin and the rest of the surface is thicker, then this portion will be concave and the track pad will be disposed on this concave portion.);

wherein the receiving portion of the internal surface prevents the touch pad from being exposed to an atmosphere outside of the housing portion (Paragraph [0024]).

Regarding claim 4, Kawa et al. disclose the notebook computer as claimed in claim 1, wherein the receiving portion has a concave portion (Paragraph [0025] states that the material where the track pad 53 is located should be made to be thin, which means that if that it is thin and the rest of the surface is thicker, then this portion will be concave.).

Regarding claim 19, Kawa et al. disclose the notebook computer as claimed in claim 1, wherein the housing portion further includes an external surface (Drawing 3b and paragraph [0023] explain that the body 2 has the surface shown as item 54 in the drawing.).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

11. Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawa et al. (JP 2002-297309).

Regarding claim 7, Kawa et al. disclose the notebook computer as claimed in claim 1.

Kawa et al. fail to teach of the notebook computer wherein the thickness of the receiving portion is about 0.5-0.8mm.

However, since it is not shown in the specification how this specific range proves to be beneficial to the overall device, it would have been obvious to "one of ordinary skill" in the art at the time the invention was made to make the thickness of the receiving portion between .5-.8 mm since a notebook computer is portable and it is important to have the overall size of the notebook computer be relatively small meaning that all the components located inside of the computer would also need to be small.

Regarding claim 8, Kawa et al. disclose the notebook computer as claimed in claim 1.

Kawa et al. fail to teach of the notebook computer wherein the difference between the thickness of the receiving portion and that of a portion, adjacent to the receiving portion, of the housing is about 0.7-1.0 mm.

However, since it is not shown in the specification how this specific range proves to be beneficial to the overall device, it would have been obvious to "one of ordinary skill" in the art at the time the invention was made to make the difference between the thickness of the receiving portion and that of a portion, adjacent to the receiving portion, of the housing to be about 0.7-1.0 mm because it is important for the housing to keep a

relatively small size but still be thicker than other components in the computer such that the internal components are protected properly.

Regarding claim 9, Kawa et al. disclose the notebook computer as claimed in claim 1.

Kawa et al. fail to teach of the notebook computer wherein a ratio between the thickness of the receiving portion and the thickness a portion, adjacent to the receiving portion, of the housing is about 1/3-1/2.

However, since it is not shown in the specification how this specific range proves to be beneficial to the overall device, it would have been obvious to "one of ordinary skill" in the art at the time the invention was made to make the ratio between the thickness of the receiving portion and that of a portion, adjacent to the receiving portion, of the housing to be about 1/3-1/2 mm because it is important for the housing to keep a relatively small size but still be thicker than other components in the computer such that the internal components are protected properly.

12. Claims 17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawa et al. (JP 2002-297309) in view of Garner (US 6,501,462).

Regarding claim 20, Kawa et al. disclose the notebook computer as claimed in claim 29.

Kawa et al. fail to teach that the housing includes a flange on the external surface surrounding a surface corresponding to the receiving portion.

Garner discloses of a notebook computer wherein the housing further includes a flange on the external surface, and the flange surrounds the surface correspond to the receiving portion (Figure 1, item 39 and column 4, lines 5-12. The examiner interprets that item 39 is a flange which surround the touch pad portion item 35.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to "one of ordinary skill" in the art at the time the invention was made to use the flange taught by Garner with the notebook computer taught by Kawa et al. in order to provide improved tactile feedback such that the touchpad can be found without looking for it with the eye.

Regarding claim 17, Kawa et al. disclose the notebook computer as claimed in claim 20.

Garner discloses of a notebook computer wherein the housing further includes a flange on the external surface, and the flange surrounds the surface correspond to the receiving portion (Figure 1, item 39 and column 4, lines 5-12. The examiner interprets that item 39 is a flange which surround the touch pad portion item 35.).

13. Claims 5-6 and 10-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawa et al. (JP 2002-297309) in view of Keely, JR. et al. (US 2002/0063694).

Regarding claim 5, Kawa et al. disclose the notebook computer as claimed in claim 1.

Kawa et al. fail to teach of the notebook computer further comprising: an adhesive member adhering the touch pad to the receiving portion.

Keely, JR. et al. disclose of a notebook computer further comprising: an adhesive member adhering a touch pad to the outer surface opening (Paragraph [0041]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to “one of ordinary skill” in the art at the time the invention was made to adhere the touch pad using adhesive as taught by Keely, JR. et al. to the outer edges of the receiving portion of the notebook computer taught by Kawa et al. in order to provide the desired stiffness, producing permanent alignment, shock control, the spread of impact forces along the edges, and liquid seal, with minimum cost, weight, and number of parts.

Regarding claim 6, Kawa et al. and Keely, JR. et al. disclose the notebook computer as claimed in claim 5.

Keely, JR. et al. also discloses wherein the touch pad is closely adjacent to the outer surface opening via the adhesive member, thereby eliminating any gap between the outer surface opening and the touch pad (Paragraph [0041]. The examiner interprets that when anything is sealed with an adhesive such that liquids are prevented from entering that the gap between the two items is eliminated.).

Regarding claim 10, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claims 1 and 5.

Regarding claim 11, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claims 5 and 6.

Regarding claim 12, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 7.

Regarding claim 13, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 8.

Regarding claim 14, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 9.

Regarding claim 15, Kawa et al. and Keely, JR. et al. disclose the method as claimed in claim 10.

Kawa et al. and Keely, JR. et al. fail to teach of the method wherein the housing is formed by injection molding.

However, it would have been obvious to "one of ordinary skill" in the art at the time the invention was made to form the housing using injection molding since it is well known that the injection molding process has high production rates, allows design flexibility, has relatively low labor, and has minimum scrap losses.

Regarding claim 16, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 4.

Regarding claim 21, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 19.

14. Claims 18 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawa et al. (JP 2002-297309) in view of Keely, JR. et al. (US 2002/0063694) and further in view of Garner (US 6,501,462).

Regarding claim 22, Kawa et al. and Keely, JR. et al. disclose the notebook computer as claimed in claim 21.

Kawa et al. and Keely, JR. et al. fail to teach that the housing includes a flange on the external surface surrounding a surface corresponding to the receiving portion.

Garner discloses of a notebook computer wherein the housing further includes a flange on the external surface, and the flange surrounds the surface correspond to the receiving portion (Figure 1, item 39 and column 4, lines 5-12. The examiner interprets that item 39 is a flange which surround the touch pad portion item 35.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to “one of ordinary skill” in the art at the time the invention was made to use the flange taught by Garner with the notebook computer taught by the combination of Kawa et al. and Keely, JR. et al. in order to provide improved tactile feedback such that the touchpad can be found without looking for it with the eye.

Regarding claim 18, Kawa et al. and Keely, JR. et al. disclose the notebook computer as claimed in claim 22.

Garner discloses of a notebook computer wherein the housing further includes a flange on the external surface, and the flange surrounds the surface correspond to the receiving portion (Figure 1, item 39 and column 4, lines 5-12. The examiner interprets that item 39 is a flange which surround the touch pad portion item 35.).

Conclusion

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen G. Sherman whose telephone number is (571) 272-2941. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amr Awad can be reached on (571) 272-7764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SS

15 November 2007

AMR A. AWAD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
